

## REMARKS

Claims 5-11, 13, 19, and 20, as amended, remain herein.

This Preliminary Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2005, and the Advisory Action of July 15, 2005.

Claims 1-4, 12, 14-18, 21, 22, 53, and 59 have been canceled without prejudice. All rejections of these claims in the Office Action of March 29, 2005, are therefore moot.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 8 and 19 are allowable. Claims 7 and 9 were amended to change their dependency to allowed claim 8, and claims 13 and 20 were amended to be dependent upon allowed claim 19.

The Office Action of March 29, 2005, rejected independent claim 5, and claims 6, 9, 12-17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Balachandran in view of Rohrbaugh.

Applicants' amended claim 5 recites weighting possible faults, and providing fault coverage by identifying a fault coverage value from the sum of the weighted fault coverage of detected weighted possible faults. Support for this amendment is provided by the instant application at, *inter alia*, Figs. 28-29, and the corresponding description beginning at page 37, line 10.

The Office Action equates the claimed step of weighting with Balachandran's alleged teachings of ranking. Applicants do not concur with this rationale. Balachandran does not teach or suggest summing a weighted fault coverage of detected weighted fault coverage, or providing fault coverage by identifying a fault coverage value from the sum of the weighted fault coverage of detected weighted possible faults. The Rohrbaugh patent is similarly devoid of any such teaching or suggestion. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in either of the applied

references of any desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest Applicants' claimed invention.

The Advisory Action stated that amendments to claim 5 as filed June 29, 2005, were grammatically incorrect because of the recitation of the "possibility of" weighted possible faults. Applicants do not concur, but have nonetheless amended claim 5 to recite "fault coverage" instead of "possibility." Consistent with the express use of this language with respect to the embodiment of Figs. 28 and 29, such language is both definite and grammatically correct.

Accordingly, claim 5 recites a combination of elements which is patentably distinct over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 5, as well as dependent claims 6, 9, 12-17, and 20, and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the allowance of claims 8 and 19, dependent claims 7, 9, 13, and 20 are now patentably distinct over the applied prior art, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the same are therefore requested.

Accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Any amendments to the claims not specifically argued to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art have been made for clarity, a purpose unrelated to patentability.

If a telephone conference would be of value, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Takaki YOSHIDA et al  
Serial No.: 09/697,305

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28951.5186).

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst, Reg. No. 25,177  
Scott D. Watkins, Reg. No. 36,715

Date: August 26, 2005

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202-429-3000  
Fax: 202-429-3902